

(ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಬಂಗಾರಪ್ಪ)

ಸೇರಿದ ರಿಕಾರ್ಡ್‌ಗಳನ್ನು ತಮ್ಮ ಮನೆಯಲ್ಲೆಯೇ ಇಟ್ಟುಕೊಂಡು ತಮ್ಮ ಹುದ್ದೆಗಳು ಹೋಗುತ್ತವೆಂದು ಮನಸ್ಸಿಗೆ ಬಂದಹಾಗೆ ಬರೆಯುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಸರ್ಕಾರವನ್ನು ಲೆಸ್ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಕೂಡಲೇ ಆ ಹುದ್ದೆಗಳನ್ನು ಭರ್ತಿಮಾಡುತ್ತೀರಾ ಮತ್ತು ಆ ಶ್ಯಾನುಭೋಗರಿಂದ ಕೂಡಲೇ ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ವಶಕ್ಕೆ ಆ ರಿಕಾರ್ಡ್‌ಗಳನ್ನು ಪಡೆಯುತ್ತೀರಾ ?

Sri H. V. KOUJALGI.—Government is very anxious that the new Village Accountants are appointed very early and steps are being taken in that direction. I hope that these appointments will be made very shortly. In some cases the matter has been taken up to the High Court and only in such cases the matter has been delayed. Government have also received some allegations that the old Shanubhogues are not handing over *daftars*, etc. Of course, the Government have taken all precautions.

Sri M. MALLAPPA.—In most cases, the Government have appointed hereditary Shanbhogues and posted them to the very place where they were serving and the position of the people has become precarious. Those old Shanbhogues are not discharging their work either as village accountant or as Secretary of the Panchayat and work is suffering. Cannot others be appointed as village accountants in their place ?

Sri H. V. KOUJALGI.—According to the rules, the old Shanbhogues also are eligible for appointment as village accountants. Of course, in some cases some relaxation is made in respect of their age and qualifications. After their appointment as fresh officials, their work is to the satisfaction of the department.

Land Reforms Act Amendments urged by Conference of Land Owners

279. **Sri RATNAKUMAR KATTEMAR (Moodabidri).**—

Will the Minister for Revenue be pleased to state :—

(a) whether the Government have received any resolutions passed at the various Conferences of Land owners held in the State, urging the Government to bring an immediate amendment to the Land Reforms Act ;

(b) whether the Government is aware that the Ryotwari Land Owners are not getting the rents since the last five years *i.e.*, from 1965 ;

(c) whether the Government is forcibly recovering the Land Revenue from such Land Owners ignoring their grievances :

(d) whether the Government has received my representations to the effect that so many tenants have kept the fields fallow since the last eight years or more and that they have not paid the “ Levy ” also ;

(e) whether the tenants are being allowed to remain in possession of the holdings even when they are in arrears of rent for more than two years and at present even up to the last five years contrary to the provisions of the Land Reforms Act;

(f) whether the Government are aware that the Ryotwari Land Owners are not given preference to resume the lands for self-cultivation from the tenants at least up to the ceiling limit?

Sri H. V. KOUJALGI (Minister for Revenue).—

(a) Yes.

(b) No.

(c) The liability of the landlord to pay land Revenue is not contingent on his being able to recover rent.

(d) Yes.

(e) No.

(f) The Landlords are permitted to resume the lands up to the extent permitted by Section 14 read with Section 16.

ಶ್ರೀ ರತನ್ ಕುಮಾರ್ ಕಟ್ಟೇಮಾರ್.—ಈ ಭೂಸುಧಾರಣೆ ಕಾನೂನಿನಿಂದ ನಮ್ಮ ರಾಜ್ಯದ ರಾಜ್ಯ ಟ್ರಸ್ಟಿಯನ್ ಕೋರ್ಪೊರೇಷನ್ 1965ನೇ ಇನಿಯಿಂದ ಇಷ್ಟರವರೆಗೆ ಒಟ್ಟು ಎಷ್ಟು ಕೇಸುಗಳು ಪೆಂಡಿಂಗ್‌ನಲ್ಲವೆ?

Sri H. V. KOUJALGI.—That is a separate question. If another question is put, I will answer.

ಶ್ರೀ ರತನ್ ಕುಮಾರ್ ಕಟ್ಟೇಮಾರ್.—ತಾವು ಹಿಂದೆ ಭೂಮಾಲೀಕರು ಏನೊಂದು ಮನವಿಗಳನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೋ ಆ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿ ತರುತ್ತೇನೆಂದು ತಿಳಿಸಿದ್ದರಿ. ಅದರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಯಾವ ರಹ ಕ್ರಮವನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದೀರಿ?

Sri H. V. KOUJALGI.—I have received the representation of those small landholders and big landholders. But the Government have not taken any decision as yet. I had not promised that I would bring any amendments on the floor of this House in this connection. But some amendments are to be brought but they are all formal amendments.

ಶ್ರೀಮತಿ ಕೆ. ಎಸ್. ನಾಗರತ್ನಮ್ಮ.—ಇಲ್ಲಿ (ಇ) ಯಲ್ಲಿ ಭೂಮಾಲೀಕರು ಭೂಕಂದಾಯವನ್ನು ಕೊಡುವುದು ಅವರು ಗೇಣಿಯನ್ನು ವಸಾಲು ಮಾಡುವುದನ್ನು ಅವಲಂಬಿಸಿರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದೀರಿ. ಕೆಲವು ಹೆಣ್ಣು ಮಕ್ಕಳು ಗೇಣಿ ಕೇಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಹೋದರೆ, ಅವರು ಮಾನ ಹಾಸಿಯಾಗುವ ಹಾಗೆ ಎರ್ರಾ ಬಯ್ಯು ಕಳುಹಿಸುವುದರಿಂದ ಅವರು ಅವರ ಮಕ್ಕಳು ಮರಿಗಳನ್ನು ಸಾಕುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಕಷ್ಟವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಇದಕ್ಕೂ ಅದಕ್ಕೂ ಸಂಬಂಧವಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಹೇಳುವುದು ಸರ್ಕಾರ ನ್ಯಾಯವೆಂದು ಭಾವಿಸಿದೆಯೇ?

Sri H. V. KOUJALGI.—So far as the payment of land revenue is concerned, it has to be paid according to law and the Land Revenue Act. It is the liability of the landholder to pay land revenue. So far as the recovery of rent is concerned, it all depends upon the relationship between the two or the landholder has to seek remedy in the proper Court.

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಭಾಸ್ಕರ ಶೆಟ್ಟಿ.—ಸ್ವಾಮಿ. ದಕ್ಷಿಣ ಕನ್ನಡ ಜಿಲ್ಲೆಯ ಪರಿಸ್ಥಿತಿ ಒಂದು ಬೇರೆ ರೀತಿಯೇ ಆಗಿದ್ದು, ಈ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಈ ಮನೆಯ ಮತ್ತು ಮೇಲ್ಮನೆಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಸರ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಒಂದು ಅರ್ಜಿಯನ್ನು ಸಲ್ಲಿಸಿ, ಬಹಳ ಕಡಿಮೆ ಹಿಡುವಳಿದಾರರು ದಕ್ಷಿಣ ಕನ್ನಡದಲ್ಲಿ ಇದ್ದಾರೆ; ಅವರ ಮಟ್ಟಿಗೆ ನ್ಯಾಯ ಗೇಣಿ ಮಾಡಿ, ವಕ್ಕಲು ಎಬ್ಬಿಸದಂತೆ ಮಾಡಿ, ನ್ಯಾಯ ದೊರೆಯುವಂತೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದು, ಒಂದು ಮನವಿಯನ್ನು ಸಲ್ಲಿಸಿದ್ದು ನಿಜವೇ? ಮತ್ತು ಅ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಏನು ಕಾರ್ಯಕ್ರಮ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ?

Sri H. V. KOUJALGI.—Such a representation has been given. But the Government have not yet taken any decision.

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಎಂ. ಇದ್ದಿನ್ನಬ್ಬ.—(ಇ) ಗೆ ಉತ್ತರವಾಗಿ ಭೂಕಂದಾಯ ಗೇಣಿ ವಸೂಲು ಮಾಡುವುದನ್ನು ಅವಲಂಬಿಸಿರುವುದಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದೀರಿ. ಒಂದು ಕಡೆಯಿಂದ ಕಂದಾಯ ಕೊಡಲೇ ಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳುವುದು, ವಕ್ಕಲುಗಳು ಗೇಣಿಯನ್ನು ಕೊಡವಿರುವುದು, ಮತ್ತು ಹೀಗೆ ನಾಲ್ಕೈದು ವರ್ಷ ಸಾಗುವಳಿ ಮಾಡದಿರುವುದು, ಇವೆನ್ನೆಲ್ಲಾ ತಪ್ಪಿಸಿ, ಧನಗಳಿಗೂ, ವಕ್ಕಲುಗಳಿಗೂ ಒಂದು ಒಳ್ಳೆಯ ಪಾತಾವರಣವನ್ನು ಕಲ್ಪಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಒಂದು ಒಳ್ಳೆಯ ಕ್ರಮವನ್ನು ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದು ಒಳ್ಳೆಯದಲ್ಲವೇ?

Sri H. V. KOUJALGI.—Liability to pay land revenue by the landlord and the landlord to recover rent are there from time immemorial. This has occurred after the Land Reforms Act came into being.

ಶ್ರೀ ಬೋಳ ರಘುರಾಮ ಶೆಟ್ಟಿ.—ಭೂಮಿಸೂದೆಯ ಕಾನೂನು ಪ್ರಕಾರ ನ್ಯಾಯಕ್ಕಿಂತ ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಗೇಣಿ ವಸೂಲು ಮಾಡುವುದು ತಪ್ಪು. ನ್ಯಾಯಗೇಣಿಯನ್ನು ತಾಹಸೀಲ್ದಾರರು ಉತ್ಪತ್ತಿ ನೋಡಿ ನಿರ್ಣಯ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು. ಕೆಲವು ಕಡೆ ತಾಹಸೀಲ್ದಾರರು ಉತ್ಪತ್ತಿ ಎಷ್ಟು ಎಂದು ನಿರ್ಣಯ ಮಾಡಿಲ್ಲ ಮತ್ತು ನಾಲ್ಕು ವರ್ಷಗಳಿಂದ ರ್ಯಾಂಡ್ ಟ್ರಿಬ್ಯೂನಲ್ ಕೋರ್ಟ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿ ಎಲ್ಲಾ ಕೇಸುಗಳೂ ಕೂಡ ಕೇವಲ ಅಜರ್ನ್ ಆಗುತ್ತಾ ಇರುವುದು ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಗಮನಕ್ಕೆ ಬಂದಿದೆಯೇ?

Sri H. V. KOUJALGI.—Tahsildars have issued notifications. In some cases, notifications have been held to be invalid by the High Court. If the matters are pending in the Court and they are being enquired into, for that litigation Government is in no way responsible.

Smt. WINNIFRED F. FERNANDES.—What is the action the Government will take if the cases are pending in the Tribunals for more than two years and have not been disposed of?

Sri H. V. KOUJALGI.—If the tenant does not pay the rent for two years, the remedy is provided in the Act. So far as the expeditious disposal of cases are concerned, it is for the Tribunals to see that they are disposed of early.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಗೋಪಾಲಗೌಡ.—ನಾನು ಆಗಲೇ ಎದ್ದು ನಿಂತಿದ್ದೇನೆ.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Next question.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಗೋಪಾಲಗೌಡ.—ನಾನು ಒಂದು ಉಪ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆ ಹಾಕಬೇಕು.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I request the hon. member to co-operate with the Chair. I cannot allow.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಗೋಪಾಲಗೌಡ.—ನಾನು ಉಪ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಯನ್ನು ಹಾಕಲೇ ಬೇಕು.

(The hon. member was seen sitting on the desk)

Mr. SPEAKER.—Next question 323. The hon. Member is absent.

Sri M. NAGAPPA.—Sir, I have been authorised to put the question.

HON. MEMBERS.—The House is not in order.

Question of privilege against Sri Gopala Gowda

Mr. SPEAKER.—It is not fair for the hon. Member. As a senior hon. Member Sri Gopala Gowda should be fair to others.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಗೋಪಾಲಗೌಡ.—ಸಿನ್ಹಿಯರ್ ಮೆಂಬರಿಗೆ ನೀವು ಕೊಟ್ಟ ಗೌರವ ಗೊತ್ತಾಯಿತು.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The other day hon. member knows what had happened. Some members had taken objection.

(The hon. Member Sri S. Gopala Gowda pulled out the microphone and threw it on the floor of the House.)

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA (Harihar).—Sir, as we all know Sri S. Gopal Gowda is interested in the land tenancy. When he is getting up to put a question, heavens would not have fallen if Chair had allowed him to put a question, Everything cannot go on like that.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I think this is something which cannot be allowed. It is a breach of privilege.

Sri K. PUTTASWAMY (Minister for Law, Labour and Parliamentary Affairs).—I move the motion for breach of privilege against hon. member Sri S. Gopala Gowda

Sri S. BANGARAPPA.—On a point of order

(Interruptions)

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—The hon. member is not in good health. If he wants to put one supplementary, you do not allow him to put it. It is unfair.

Sri K. PUTTASWAMY.—I have every right to move the motion of breach of privilege.

(Interruption)

Sri S. SIVAPPA.—The Hon. Minister for Parliamentary Affairs knows the parliamentary procedure. How can he move the motion of breach of privilege?

Mr. SPEAKER.—When he wants to move it, it will have precedence over other things. We have all seen what happened here. The matter that has taken place is in the view of the entire House.

Sri M. NAGAPPA.—The Chair has no right to allow any breach of privilege during question hour.